I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, after 9/11, our nation united against terrorism and

those who want to kill innocent civilians and destroy our American way

of life. New York was impacted deeply by these tragic events and we

understand first-hand the kind of unthinkable damage that can be

inflicted by hate-filled violent extremists.

I voted to support the use of force in Iraq for many reasons. Decades

of deception and violation of United Nations resolutions; invading

neighboring countries; and a litany of ruthless atrocities by Saddam

Hussein involving murdering his own people.

I believe that the best way to safeguard freedom in our nation

increasingly depends on supporting a democratic global strategy in

areas beyond our borders. That is why supporting the creation of a

self-governing Iraq is so critical to the future of both our countries.

Having said that, I am deeply disappointed in this resolution because

I believe we owe Americans more than a simple declaration of our

resolve in Iraq. We owe them an account of our progress in the Global

War on Terror; an assessment of the situation, the stakes, and the

strategy for victory in the battle for Iraq; and an affirmation we will

defend our country, defeat the enemy, and win this unsought struggle

for survival.

There are several points in this resolution that I am concerned

about. It also strikes me as merely a reiteration of the resolution we

passed last December.

First, I am disappointed in the choice of the word adversary in this

resolution. History and reality illustrate that within Iraq and the

broader Global War on Terror we do not face an adversary--we face a

very real and dangerous enemy. We should not be afraid to clearly state

what we as a nation are up against.

Secondly, philosophically, any state-sponsor of terror is a threat to

the United States, because terrorism is an attack upon the self-

evident, inalienable human rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of

happiness. This point should be clearly expressed in a resolution of

this nature.

Additionally, the second clause states ``. . . for the past two

decades, terrorists have used violence in a futile attempt to

intimidate the United States.'' This clause is too sanitized. The hard

truth is the enemy has not tried to intimidate us. The enemy has tried

to kill us and often succeeded. The enemy does so because our very

existence as sovereign citizens of a free Republic constitutes a beacon

of hope for all who are--and all who yearn to be--free; thus, we are

our enemy's paramount obstacle to world dominion.

I know firsthand the difficulties we face in Iraq. I have heard it

directly from the men and women that are fighting so hard in

Afghanistan and Iraq.

I do hope that despite my concerns that this debate provides a

clearer understanding of the threats we really face and the opportunity

to develop a strategy that protects our troops and enables our military

to develop a comprehensive strategy to win this war, transfer the power

to the Iraqi people and bring them home. It should also demonstrate

that the ``cut and run'' agenda of my colleagues on the other side of

the aisle is the wrong approach to this problem and encourages the

terrorists to wait us out and undo all that our soldiers have worked

through blood, sweat, tears and their lives to establish--a victory for

our nation and a stable and secure democracy in the Middle East.

Lastly, and most importantly, I will continue to stand by and support

U.S. troops. I must take this opportunity to pay a personal tribute to

the brave lives that have been claimed from my district: Nathan Brown,

Stephen Madison, Kevin Kimberly, Isaac Nieves, and Joseph Robsky. Their

sacrifice, and the sacrifice of their families and loved ones embody

the spirit of our great nation and principles of democracy we hold

dear.